

Amendments to the Drawings:

FIGS. 1 and 4 have been amended to change “midplane 18” to “component board 18” and to make the legends more readable. Replacements sheets are submitted herewith.



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated May 31, 2005. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 13 and 16 have been amended. Claims 2, 5, 12, and 15 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-21 remain pending in the present application.

The Specification has been amended to correct typographical errors, including amendments to the summary and abstract to comport with the amendments to independent claim 1. FIGS. 1 and 4 have been amended to change "midplane 18" to "component board 18" and to make the legends more readable. Replacements sheets are submitted herewith.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of canceled claims 2 and 5, and independent claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claims 12 and 15. Accordingly, it is submitted that no new matter has been entered.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Wallace (US 4,445,740). It is respectfully submitted that Wallace fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in amended claims 1 and 11, or independent claim 21.

Although the Examiner states that Wallace discloses a dual motion docking apparatus for docking an electronics console to a component board in a chassis, wherein the electronics console and the component board lie in the same plane of the chassis, but the electronics console must be mated with the component board at an angle orthogonal to a direction of installation of the electronics console, Wallace does

so in a different manner than recited in the claims of the present invention.

First, Wallace fails to teach or suggest “a first docking mechanism for slidably inserting the electronics console into a chassis,” as claimed. Wallace’s mechanism for sliding a circuit module 1 into a chassis assembly 3 includes a guide slot 13 located in a side of the chassis assembly 3 that guides a side of the circuit module 1 as the circuit module 1 is slid into the chassis assembly 3.

Thus, Wallace fails to disclose a first docking mechanism that includes 1) “a docking base coupled to the component board having a longitudinal female portion” and 2) “a longitudinal male portion located on an underside of the electronics console... engages the female portion of the docking base to guide the electronics console along the docking base as the electronics console is slid into the chassis,” as recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. Even if Wallace’s guide slot 13 is considered analogous to the “longitudinal female portion” and the side of Wallace’s circuit module 1 is considered an analogous to the “longitudinal male portion,” Wallace’s guide slot 13 is located in the chassis, rather than on “a docking base coupled to *the component board*,” and Wallace’s male portion, is located along the side of the circuit module 1, rather than “on *an underside of the electronics console*.”

Second, Wallace fails to teach or suggest, “a second docking mechanism for laterally moving the electronics console towards the component board,” as claimed. Wallace’s mechanism for laterally moving the circuit module 1 includes an insertion and extraction member 11 mounted on the opposite side of the module 1 and in parallel alignment with connection 9, and fulcrum 17. When the bottom edge of the circuit module number one is nested in the guide slot 15, the insertion and extraction member 11 may be rotated around the fulcrum 17 causing a cam portion 19 of the insertion and

extraction device 11 to come in contact with a brace 21 forcing the connector 9 to become engaged with the connector pin assembly 7 (col. 2, lns. 32-44).

Thus, Wallace fails to disclose a second docking mechanism that comprises 1) “a handle extending from a front of the electronics console,” and 2) “a cam mechanism having a portion that is held immobile by the docking base, wherein after the electronics console is slid into the chassis, the handle is pushed rearward by hand to actuate the cam mechanism, which then pulls the electronics console towards the component board,” as recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. Even if Wallace’s insertion and extraction member 11 is considered analogous to the handle, Wallace’s assertion and extraction number 11 is located on a side of the circuit module 1, rather than the *front* of the electronics console, and Wallace’s cam portion 19 is not “held immobile by the docking base,” which Wallace altogether fails to disclose.

The arguments above apply with full force and effect to the remaining dependent claims because they are based on allowable independent claims. Therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.


In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-21 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

August 31, 2005

Date



Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,329
(650) 493-4540